



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ran entirely along the lines of whether the ceremony would be a shock to the boy or a shock absorber. The mother wanted him to be present. "Since there is to be an abrupt change in my boy's life," urged she, "I want the ceremony to be a pleasant occasion for him, and it will be." The paternal grandmother took the opposition. "Your marriage will be a shock to him," she said, "let him learn of it little by little. Since you are going away, he need not hear of it at once." "It will be a shock," said an uncle, "but better let him have it all at once, get through with it."

To sum up, ceremonialism, and I have been referring merely to epochal ceremonialism, is not so much a bed of fossils, of relics of moribund custom, as a living manifestation of aversion to change. To primitive and modern alike, ceremonial is a shock absorber, a mitigating diversion from the change become inevitable. The crisis view of change has begun, however, to pass out; under the compulsion of our new concepts of personality, change is being met as it occurs. The time may come when life will give no clue to ceremonialism, ceremonialism having passed out of life. Then it will not be a question of tracing back a ceremonial fragment to its ancient bed, a childish puzzle, but a question of psychological diagnosis made extremely difficult by its detachment from current experience. A dying out type of psychosis may be in even more urgent need of description than a dying out people.

ELSIE CLEWS PARSONS

NEW YORK CITY

BLACKFOOT RELATIONSHIP TERMS

IN attempting to use extant collections of terms of relationship for a comparative study of Algonkian tribes, we reap the result of the former lack of interest in this subject in the form of inadequate and conflicting data. In general, the information given by investigators for individual tribes is scanty, ambiguous, and otherwise at fault. The schedules usually include only relatives in the immediate family of the person using the relationship terms, the cousins and their children being most frequently ignored, and few discriminations due to the sex of the speaker are recorded. The most comprehensive body of data, that of Morgan in his "Systems of Consanguinity and Affinity of the Human Family," containing palpable errors, apparent contradictions, and frequent omissions, is presented in an atrocious form, such that it discouraged subsequent research in this field. Only in the belief that it may stimulate the acquisition of new material for the correction of the old, and to place on record for the convenience of field-workers the form of an Algon-

kian system, have we presumed to redescribe the Blackfoot relationship systems recorded by Morgan, Wissler, and others.

The Blood and Piegan systems present features of considerable comparative interest. As is commonly the case among Algonkian tribes, we find in both systems that in the ascending generations, beginning with that of the grandparents, relatives are distinguished only on the basis of sex (males: Blood; *nä-ahxs'*; Piegan; *nä-ah'-sä*: females: Blood; *ne-tä'-ke-ah'xs*; Piegan; *ne-tä'-ke-äse*), while all the members of the generations of the grandchild, greatgrandchild, etc., are merged in one group (Blood: *nee-so'-tän*; Piegan: *nee-so'-tan*).

Such is their phonetic similarity that there is probably an identity of the terms for father's sister, father's brother's wife, mother's sister, mother's brother's wife, and stepmother (Blood: *ne-to'-tahxs*, *ne-to'-tah'xs*, *ne-to'-toax-is*; Piegan: *ne-to'-tarse*, *n'-to'-tox-is*), leaving a special term for mother (Blood: *nee-crist'*; Piegan: *neex-ist'*). A second group is comprised of father's brother, mother's sister's husband and stepfather (*ne-to'-to-mä*), and, corresponding to the first case, a special term is applied to father (Blood: *nin'-nä*; Piegan: *nin*). The third group that is usually found in an Algonkian system is here treated in an unusual way. For the Piegan, Morgan records a term for mother's brother and father's sister's husband (*ne-to-tah'se'*) which may be phonetically related to that for the father's sister group, but according to Wissler the term applied to these relatives is that for elder brother (*nĩ'ssa²*) and Morgan finds this same feature among the Blood. Morgan recognizes this feature as an anomaly found only among the Crow, Hidatsa, and Blackfoot; but he adds that among the last it is not the usual form of relationship. These groupings are decidedly unusual in view of the fourfold classification of these relatives as "father," "mother," "uncle" and "aunt," based apparently on an exogamic grouping, which appears in the Arapaho, Gros Ventre, Cree, and Ojibwa¹ systems, although it is true that the last two peoples do have specific terms for father and mother.

Another group of classificatory features equally illustrative of the differences between the tribal systems may well be introduced here. While among the Piegan both sexes designate the father-in-law by a distinct term (*ne-tä'-so-ko*) and the mother-in-law by that for grandmother, a Blood man designates these persons as grandparents, and a

¹ While there is no such thing as "the Ojibwa system" (we have at hand six schedules collected among these people exhibiting morphological differences), the features used here for comparative purposes represent the general structure of such a system.

Blood woman, as father and mother. In both systems there are distinct terms for husband (Blood: *no'-mä*; Piegan: *nome*) and wife (Blood: *ne-toh'-ke'-man*; Piegan: *ne-to-ke'-man*; cf. man's brother's wife: *n'-do'-to-ke-man*). Both men and women apply the same term to the stepbrother (Blood: *ne-to'-toase*; Piegan: *ne-to'-to-pä-pe*), but although the Blood class the stepsister with the stepmother, the Piegan designate her by a distinct term (*n'-to'-to-kame*).

Quite as unusual as the classificatory features outlined above, but fortunately more susceptible of comparative study, are the terminological groupings in the speaker's own generation. Only in this generation do we find an age factor as a basis of classification. The father's brother's son and mother's sister's son, as well as the speaker's own brothers, are termed elder or younger brothers (Blood: *nis'-sä*, and *nis-kun'*; Piegan: *neese-sä*, and *nis-kun'-ä*); while the daughters of father's brother and mother's sister are classed with own sister as elder or younger sisters (*nee'-his-tä*, or *nee-mis'-tä*, and *ne-sis'-sä*). For the Blackfoot proper, however, Tims notes that there is but one term applied to younger brother or younger sister, the usual feature in Algonkian systems; but men and women use different terms for this relationship (*nēs kün'* and *ni sīs' sa*). All this is readily comprehensible, but not so the grouping of cross-cousins. Among the Blood, we find that a man uses a distinct term (*noh'-sä-kin'-ame*) for his male cross-cousin, this differing from that employed by a woman (*no-in-nä*): a man designates his mother's brother's daughter by a term (*ne-tä-kame*) which may possibly be phonetically related to the Piegan term for stepsister (*n'-to'-to-kame*), while a woman calls the same person elder or younger sister. Among the Piegan, however, while a man calls his male cross-cousin by one term (*n'-to'-tes-tä-mo'*), a second term (*ne'-tä-kame*), possibly related to that for stepsister, is used for his father's sister's daughter, and a third term (*n'-do'-to-ke-man'*) used for mother's brother's daughter is also that for wife's sister.¹ A woman speaking of the same persons designates the first by the third term above, the second as elder or younger sister, and the third by a distinct term (*ne-wä'-toase*) which is probably identical with a Blood man's term for his sister's son (*no-ä'-toase*).

Before appealing to a comparison with other tribal systems for an explanation of these seeming anomalies, we shall do well to consider two other groups of classificatory features. The first group is that of relationships of affinity in the speaker's own generation. Among both

¹ In this connection we may note with Rivers that the terms for brother- or sister-in-law are often phonetically similar to those for cross-cousins.

Blood and Piegan, a man classes together the wives of all his cousins with those of his own brothers (Blood: *ne-to'-to-ke-man*; Piegan: *n'-do'-to-ke-man'*), and to these a Piegan adds his wife's sister. Further, according to Morgan, a Blood man applies to his wife's brother's wife the term for elder brother! In both tribes, a man classes his wife's brother with the husbands of his cousins and that of his sister (*nis-tä-mo*), and among the Blood, with his wife's sister's husband. With a Blood or Piegan woman speaking, a similar classification is made of her husband's brother and the husbands of her cousins and sisters (*ne-to'-to-yome*); to these, however, a Blood woman alone adds a wife's sister. One important feature in which the woman's system in both tribes differs from that of a man is that of applying to a husband's sister, husband's brother's wife, and the wives of her cousins and brothers, the term used by both men and women for the wives of their own sons and those of their brother's and sister's sons (*nee-mis'*).

Equally significant from a comparative viewpoint is the second group of classificatory features in the generation of the speaker's children, where the Blood system again differs from the Piegan, although in each tribe we find a threefold grouping. First considering the usage when a man speaks, we find in both tribes the inclusion with the sister's son (Blood: *no-ä'-toase*; Piegan: *n'-do'-to-yose*) and sister's daughter (*nee-mis'-sä*) of all children of female blood relatives of the speaker's generation. Corresponding to this grouping, we find that children of male blood relatives of the speaker's generation are classed as son (*noh'-ko'-ä*) and daughter (*ne-tan'-ä*) by the Blood, but as stepson (*n'-do'-to-ko*) and stepdaughter (*n'-to'-to-tun*) by the Piegan. Finally, separate designations are used for stepchildren (male: *ne-to'-to-koh'-a*; female: *ne-to'-to-tun*) by the Blood and for children (male: *noh'-ko*; female: *ne-tan'-ä*) by the Piegan. In both tribes we find that these categories are reversed when a woman speaks, for then the terms previously applied to the children of male relatives are applied to the children of female relatives, and vice versa.

It is evident that the conceptual complexity of these systems has been materially increased by the errors and omissions in Morgan's schedules. It is unfortunate that Wissler's data, in "The Social Life of the Blackfoot Indians," and Uhlenbeck's remarks on the same, are too inadequate to throw light on apparent discrepancies, and that no material is available from the Blackfoot proper. Added to our difficulties is the fact that Morgan's orthography is execrable, and that until material is forthcoming from a new source, even the main classificatory features of these systems will remain in doubt.

Whether we are to regard many of these peculiarities as discrepancies or with some of the major terminological groupings as criteria of tribal differences, cannot be answered by an appeal to these data alone. In the absence of direct corroborative data, we may be permitted to extend our comparison to the neighboring tribes, and to interpret the systems of the Blackfoot tribes in the light of other relationship systems. Whereas we find that the Ojibwa and Cree distinguish cross-cousins from a group comprised of own brothers and sisters and the children of the speaker's father's brother and mother's sister, the Arapaho and Gros Ventre group all cousins with brothers and sisters. As we have seen, both Blood and Piegan have a dual division of the members of the speaker's generation, resembling the Ojibwa in this classificatory feature, yet certain of the cross-cousins are designated as *geschwister*. Further, our comparative viewpoint is legitimized by a feature common to all of these tribes; regardless of the manner in which cross-cousins are designated, their spouses and their children are classed as though those of the speaker's brothers and sisters.

There remains one other way in which we may regard these apparent discrepancies. Although Morgan gives no evidence that would warrant the supposition, it may be that he has recorded for the several tribes non-corresponding pairs of alternative terms for a given relationship. Such alternative designations, and their relative degrees of use, have been recorded for some of the Siouan tribes. In this connection we note that Uhlenbeck alone records special forms for terms in allocution, which is interesting since vocative and non-vocative forms are found among the Sioux. What effect the use of certain terms as nicknames or terms of endearment may have had in shaping relationship terminology is another point on which our data throw no light.

LESLIE SPIER

NEW YORK CITY

ERRONEOUS INTERPRETATION OF THE "TEARS GREETING"

IN the Sloane collection of the British Museum are preserved some aquarelles representing scenes of Brazilian Indian life. The whole codex bears the title: "Drawings of Indian Dresses, Chinese Buildings," etc.

The first of the above-mentioned aquarelles, on folio 29 of the codex, size 44 by 28 cm., is accompanied by a manuscript note of the chief of the manuscript department saying:

"The ceremony of cutting the arrow of the dead person who has no further use of it."